

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 24, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 10-14. This reply amends claim 10 and cancels claims 11-14. Claim 10 remains pending and under consideration.

Interview Summary

On October 18, 2005, the Examiner and Applicant's Representative discussed the status of claim 12. The Examiner told the Applicant's Representative that the Examiner did not consider the patentability of claim 12 over the prior art because the Examiner was unable to ascertain its scope.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,247,661 ("Hager") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,787,262 ("Shakib") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,249,268 ("Doucet"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations directed to the feature previously recited in claim 12, as

an electronic mail outputting unit which automatically outputs an electronic mail to a corporate organization identified by the one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name that is used by said processing unit to replace the other one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the attribute information of the read distribution target management table, if a reply confirming that replacement is correct is received from the corporate organization within a predetermined time period from a time the electronic mail is output by said electronic mail outputting unit.

None of Hager, Shakib and Doucet teach or suggest any feature comparable to this feature of claim 10. As such, none of the prior art cited by the Examiner renders claim 10 unpatentable.

As the Examiner has acknowledged that patentability of claim 12 was not considered due to the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, there has been no examination of the features now recited in claim 10, despite the previous inclusion of all features now recited in the claims as previously presented. Therefore, it is submitted that the next Office Action should not be final.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 12 was rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for indefiniteness. As noted above, claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the feature previously recited in claim 12, using slightly different wording which hopefully the Examiner will find recites the invention with sufficient clarity to not warrant another rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

If the Examiner finds any indefiniteness in claim 10, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned prior to issuing another Office Action, to arrange an Examiner Interview for the purpose finding language that the Examiner finds sufficiently clear to be able to search the prior art.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this reply, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/24/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer

Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Jan 24, 2006
STAAS & HALSEY
By: SKS Jan
Date: Jan 24, 2006